REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

By this amendment, claims 1, 9, 11 and 13 are amended. Support can be found in original claims 9, 11 and 13. Claim 22 is amended to clarify the connection relationship as required by the examiner. The amendment is supported by Figs. 2A and 2B. No new matter is introduced. Further, claims 19-21 are cancelled without prejudice. Item 10 of the Office Action indicated that Claims 8-14 were drawn to allowable subject matter. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112. The Office Action rejected claim 22 under Section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 22 has been amended to recite that the system chip, the control management device, the LPC bus, and the peripheral I/O control device are electrically connected with one another in series. Applicant submits that the foregoing amendment overcomes the Examiner's rejection of claim 22.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102 and 103. The Office Action rejected claims 1-5 and 15-21 under Section 102(e) as being anticipated by Hawkins et al. Claims 6-7 were rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawkins et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Re claims 1-18

Hawkins et al. fail to disclose or suggest the assertion of first and second processing signals in normal and abnormal states of a specified device, respectively, as recited in amended claim 1. On the contrary, Hawkins' first and second states cited by the Examiner indicate two different situations that the control management device 40 operates with LMBC interface 70 and SMC interface 72, respectively (see Page 3-4, Paragraph 5 of the Office Action). Therefore, Hawkins et al. do not disclose or suggest first and second processing signals in normal and abnormal states of a specified device. Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 and its dependent claims are not anticipated by Hawkins et al.

Further, as described in paragraphs [0008], [0028] and [0033] of the present specification, the invention provides an objective of enabling maintenance from a remote terminal when there is an abnormal situation occurring. The assertion of first and second processing signals in normal and abnormal states of a specified device, respectively, permits this objective to be

OIPE
IAP57
SEP 2 9 2005
PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

accomplished. In Hawkin et al., however, there is no such motivation seen. Therefore, the amended claim 1 and its dependent claims would not have been obvious from the disclosure of Hawkin et al.

Re claim 22

Hawkins et al. fail to disclose or suggest the assertion of a processing signal to be upstream transmitted to the system chip or downstream transmitted to the peripheral I/O control device via the LPC bus when the system chip is in a crash state. Therefore, the amended claim 22 is not anticipated by Hawkins et al.

In view of the foregoing, allowance of all pending claims 1-18 and 22 is thus respectfully requested. If there are any remaining issues preventing allowance of the pending claims that may be clarified by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

E R Witt

Evan R. Witt
Reg. No. 32,512
Attorney for Applicant

Date: September 27, 2005

MADSON & METCALF
Gateway Tower West
15 West South Temple, Suite 900
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101
Telephone: 801/537-1700